

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/731,521 | 12/09/2003 | Sudhir V. Shah | 2629.1003-010 | 3717 |
| 21005 | 7590 11/30/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD | | | WINSTON, RANDALL O | |
| P.O. BOX 9133 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| CONCORD, | CONCORD, MA 01742-9133 | | 1654 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | 10/731,521 | SHAH, SUDH | IR V. |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| Interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Randall Winston | 1654 | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO | personnel): | | |
| (1) <u>Randall Winston</u> . | (3)N. Scott Pierce. | | |
| (2) <u>Mary K. Murray</u> . | (4) <u>Sudhir V. Shah</u> . | | • |
| Date of Interview: <u>hNovember 16, 2004</u> . | | | |
| Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant | 2)⊠ applicant's representa | tive] | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: all, in general. | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. of |) | □ N/A. | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | I to if an agreeme | ent was |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. | opy of the amendments that | agreed would rei at would render th | nder the claims ne claims |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse s | last Office action has alrea THE MAILING DATE OF T OF THE SUBSTANCE OF | ady been filed, Af THIS INTERVIEW | PPLICANT IS SUMMARY |
| | | | |
| | | • | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| / | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. | Examiner's s | signature, if requir | red |

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner has agreed to make the next offfice action of applicant's 10/731, 521 a non-final rejection for the following reasons: The Green Reference ('482) does not anticipate the claimed invention. Also, examiner will consider applicant's representative argument which applicant representative has stated that the Green rejection does not anticipate the claimed invention because a patient being treated by dialysis is not undergoing treatment of a progressive kidney disease. A patient on renal dialysis is at end stages of kidney disease, thus, treating a patient on renal dialysis with an iron chelator, is not treatment of a human with a progressive kidney disease. Discussed other reference of record in novelty and obviousness rejection. Discussed 112, second paragraph rejection.